DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 231 IR 009 271

AUTHOR Monroe, Margaret E.
TITLE Issues in Field Experience as an Element in the Library School Curriculum. A Background Paper.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Association of American Library Schools (Washington, DC, January 29-February 1, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum; *Experiential Learning; Graduate Study; *Internship Programs; *Library Education; Library Schools; Library Science; *Masters Programs; *Practicums

ABSTRACT

This paper presents some definitions and makes distinctions among the forms of field experience drawn from the literature, and surveys the goals of librarianship and library education in using field experience as an element in the library school curriculum at the master's level. Further, it explores learning theory for insights on the contributions field experience can make to professional education, identifies typical weaknesses and administrative problems in its implementation, and examines alternatives to a full-fledged field experience program. A bibliography listing more than 60 sources is provided. (Author/FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200231

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ISSUES IN FIELD EXPERIENCE AS AN ELEMENT IN THE LIBRARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

A Background Paper

AALS 1981 Conference

by

Margaret E. Monroe

IR009271

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret E. Monroe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ISSUES IN FIELD EXPERIENCE AS AN ELEMENT IN THE LIBRARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

A Background Paper
AALS 1981 Conference

by

Margaret E. Monroe

Field experience, in any of its diversity of forms, has had a fluctuating role in library education, and the 1980s are seeing an upsurge of attention to this topic. This paper sets forth some definitions and distinctions among the forms of field experience drawn from the literature, and surveys the goals of librarianship and library education in using field experience as an element in the library school curriculum at the master's level. Further, it explores learning theory for insights on the contributions field experience can make to professional education, identifies the typical weaknesses and administrative problems in implementation, and examines alternatives to a full-fledged field experience program. The focus throughout the paper is not on answers to questions but rather on the issues that need discussion and research.

Definitions

Field experience may be viewed as taking place either prior to professional study, concurrent with and/or as part of professional study, or following professional study. We shall rule out consideration here of the apprenticeship, employment, or training that takes place prior to professional study, as well as the in-service training or post-degree internships that follow professional study, but concentrate on those forms of field experience which have a potential role as an element in the master's curriculum in library education: practicums, field projects, pre-master's internships, trainee programs, work-study programs.

Practicums, while often used to refer to the whole spectrum of field experience guided by the academic institution, will be used here more precisely to refer to relatively short-term work experience (2 to 6 weeks of full-time employment in a library situation, or a semester or two of approximately 10 to 12 hours weekly). Typically the practicum is pursued in the same library for the total experience, often in a diversity of aspects of librarianship but sometimes in assignment to a single broad area, such as reference services, children's services, or administrative processes. Field projects, while often of similar duration, carry greater autonomy and responsibility, and are focussed on the accomplishment of a specific task rather than designed to explore a diversity of tasks. Pre-master's internships are characterized by full-time work, usually after all or most of the other master's degree requirements have been met, and carry responsibility and autonomy similar to that for the field project; their duration is usually of several months to a year. Trainee programs and work-study programs usually involve paid employment at a sub-professional level and require activities selected to serve the needs of the library rather than

serving the learning needs of the student, although the model trainee program takes the learning needs of the student into account. These two programs tend to be open-ended employment rather than oriented to the academic year, and usually are pursued for the potential full-time employment of the student by the host library when the master's degree has been conferred; these forms of field experience will be considered here only for their potential as elements of the professional curriculum when the planning for student learning is shared by the host library with the library school faculty and with the student.

The literature on library education's use of field experience as an element in the master's curriculum has been enriched with current surveys and historical and philosophical publications within the last five years (Palmer, 1975; Tietjen, 1975; Witucke, 1976; Coburn, 1980; Morehead, 1980).

Goals and Objectives

Seldom are "the right things" done for "the right reasons." The rationale for use of field experience as an element in the library school curriculum is often couched in terms that have no bearing on curriculum or on the learning process. Current pressures for field experience often come from students who want to meet library employer demands for "experience," or from library school administrators who see its usefulness in extending the period of student enrollment at a time when admissions and course enrollments have dropped (Conant, 1980; Darling and Belanger, 1980). Our exploration of the goals and objectives of field experience acknowledges the importance of these reasons but rejects them as part of a rationale for the use of field experience as an element in the curriculum. We will focus on the use of field experience for its contributions to the learning situation.

Field experience came into library education from the roots of apprenticeship, and enabled library educators to compensate for the lack of textbooks and an established learning technology from the 1880s to the 1930s. After the stress on theory over practice emerged in library education through the 1940s and 1950s, field experience dropped in favor and has only in the 1970s begun to re-emerge as a potentially significant approach to bridging between theory and practice. (See historical reviews in Palmer, 1975; Coburn, 1980; Morehead, 1980.) Important analysis of field experience and its potential for professional education in librarianship appeared in Williamson (1923), Reece (1936), St. John (1938), and Stallman (1954). Current analyses such as in Morehead (1980) and in reports of experimental library education by Patricia B. Knapp (1965), Robert N. Case (1974, 1975) and Martha Jane Zachert (1975) document the potential of field experience for library education.

Current statements of rationale for incorporating field experience in the library school curriculum focus not only on bridging between theory and practice but also on sophisticating the student in awareness of the work environment; on sensitivity to personal relationships with staff, supervisors and clients (Lukenbill, 1976); or on developing competence in the tasks of professional work (Morehead, 1980; Prytherch, 1979). The need for field experience as the only channel to the accomplishment of these purposes, however, is by no means universally acknowledged (Powell, 1974; Conant, 1980).

Morehead bases his case for "work contact" as an integral part of library education on the perception that "professional schools cannot be content merely with transmitting knowledge, although knowledge is important to them; they must be sure that the graduates are both knowledgeable and competent to practice." (Morehead, 1980, p. 11.) Adult educator Malcolm S. Knowles (1978) sees the demand for competence in the 1980s to be equal to the demand for knowledge, and proposes educational response to this demand. Lloyd Elliott, President of George Washington University, drew a parallel between medicine and librarianship when he commented: "The requirement of the internship is an action taken by the public through its legislative processes to guard the public against inadequately-trained physicians." (Darling and Belanger, 1980) The long-sustained professional and legal commitment to use of field experience by those preparing school librarians has been based on the need to develop personal relationship skills and competent performance in a range of specific tasks, since so many school librarians have to assume total responsibility without a period of in-service training. (Case, 1974; Woodworth, 1969).

Prytherch (1979) provided a detailed roster of goals for fieldwork based on analysis of professional literature: (1) linking of theory to practice, especially in management, communication, and interpersonal skills; (2) enabling the school's monitoring of student motivation, morale, and attitudes; (3) effecting a university influence on the practice of librarianship through student contribution to the work of libraries even while students learn; (4) "learning through doing," linked closely to competency-based education. These goals might be focussed, said Prytherch, at either the student awareness level or the student competence level. Implicit in this issue is the question: How closely should fieldwork be linked to course work? closely in specific segments? or provided in an extended, generalized experience? Prytherch (1979, p. 20) reported a trend toward "limited field experience, designed to meet specific needs in specific courses" and cited the many practicums in reference work (e.g., Bichteler, 1974; Lynch, 1975) and the experiments of High John (Moses, 1972) and at Burnaby Public Library (Bewley, 1975).

The professional fields of medicine, public administration, education, and social work have regularly relied upon field experience as an essential ingredient in preparing practitioners, and their rationales are available to us (Handbook for Professional and Administrative Internships, 1972; Henry, 1976; Sexton, 1975). The issues recently raised in legal education, which is newly converting to use of field experience, may also be immediately relevant. The Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility (CLEPR), founded in 1968, states: "We stand for certain changes in legal education because we want to see more professional development in the course of so long an educational enterprise. We revere intellectual development but insist that it must be tested in action and not just on paper, if we are to have professional education in law schools." (Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility, 1973). The CLEPR document goes on to justify "clinical experience" as integrating intellect and personality "in the pressure cooker of responsibility," and underscores the importance of field experience in developing commitment to ethical relationships and professional responsibility.

Opponents of the fundamental changes which CLEPR has been counseling for legal education have turned to such apologists for the status quo as John R. Peden, Senior Lecturer in Law, University of Sydney (1972) who, while rejecting a field experience orientation for legal education, identifies alternatives in experiential learning such as simulations comparable to the well-established "moot court," as well as case method and role-play. Nevertheless the impact of the New York University Criminal Law Clinic field laboratory model has been impressive, and the question in legal education seems no longer to be "whether" there should be experiential learning, but rather "how" that experiential learning should be developed.

In general, the other professions have looked to field experience and its alternatives in experiential learning for fulfillment of needs identified by Sexton (1975): (1) skills development, (2) developing a "feel" for the situation and seeing how people behave, (3) socialization into the profession in terms of values, behaviors with colleagues and with those served, (4) problem identification, analysis and solution, and (5) facilitating social change in the profession.

Learning Theory

Learning theory provides the foundation upon which field experience is designed. The expansion of knowledge in the areas of experiential learning, of the relationship of theory to practice, of competency-based education is reviewed briefly here for its relevance to field experience in professional education.

"Experiential learning" is the broad field from which field experience draws its vitality. Sexton and Ungerer (1975) define experiential learning as "learning outside the normal classroom environment that has been planned for prior to the experience." While academia has sometimes envisioned experiential learning as designed to serve the needs of the Open University (Keeton, 1976) where students may be "academically alienated and academically disadvantaged," usually such experiential learning is seen as a somewhat valuable supplement to "instruction in basic texts" for most students (Houle, cited by Keeton, p. 11). Keeton himself, however, sees all learning as "the transformation of experience into ever more maturing insights and the development of the self into an ever more responsive and responsible participant in a mutually fulfilling society"(p. 11). The links between "information assimilation" through print and lecture (high in efficiency of learning) and the evolving of insights and principles from experience (with the heightened reality that promotes recall and utilization) are probed by James S. Coleman (Keeton, 1976, pp. 49-61). Morehead (1973), in exploring experiential learning's potential for library education, turned to Patricia B. Knapp's proposal of a library-centered library education that would allow the student "the excitement of discovering fundamental structure in the chaotic world of books and ideas" (p. 124). Jerome Bruner's philosophy of learning through discovery provided the roots for Knapp's Monteith College Library Experiment (Knapp, 1965; Knapp, 1968).

The discovery method of learning, strongly supported by field experience but possible also within carefully planned classroom learning situations, has an importance in professionalization of novices

demonstrated recently by Rue Bucher and Joan G. Stelling in their report of research Becoming Professional (1977). From depth study of three groups of health profession interns, Bucher and Stelling not only identified a "programming" effect of the field work situation, but also found that learning was significantly heightened with increasing degrees of autonomy and responsibility of the intern for the precisely identified task that was set for learning. The student's sense of mastery was clearly linked to increased commitment and enhanced professional identity (pp. 266-270). The degree of autonomy and the importance of success as features of field experience seemed to be of great significance in their study. Designing sequences of coursework and field experience that will assure measureable success with high degrees of student autonomy sets a challenge for programs of field work. There may be a real question whether course-related projects in the field may not be essential to the sense of mastery and professional commitment. If the phenomenon is true of all professional education, the question arises: Is there an obligation to assure this level of experience and success?

One of the problems raised in considering field work is the placement of the "less capable" student. To assure success under conditions of autonomy for such students may require a scaling of tasks and intensive pre-field individual guidance which graduate education has not typically provided. Does the new vision of true professional competence require more stringent admissions standards or are there now educational strategies that allow the production of silk purses from a wider range of materials?

In 1968 Rothstein, in his challenge to library educators to reconsider field practice, observed that "practice work has come somehow to stand for opposition to theory" (Bone, 1968, p. 218). Chris Argyris and Donald Schon, in their probing inquiry Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness (1974), demonstrated the close interdependence of generalization and concrete experience in theory building, and distinguished these relationships in their discussion of inductive and deductive learning. Timing and sequencing of the experiences in field work with the theoretical discussions in course work determine the nature of the learning pattern, whether the Bruner/Knapp inductive discovery method or the deductive learning typical of the post-coursework internship as developed by Stallman (1954) at Texas.

Penetrating to one of the basic problems of traditional classroom exposition as a basis for learning, Austin Doherty and colleagues (Keeton, 1978) used the Argyris and Schon model that shows the importance of concrete experience in testing "espoused theory" (as presented in text and lecture) and sharpening its effectiveness for "theory-in-use." The value of having such reflection and analysis occur under the academic aegis is great, allowing mis-impressions of "espoused theory" to be clarified and misinterpretations of the relationship of concrete experience to theory to be explored, so that "espoused theory" is infinitely closer to "theory-in-use" than has typically been the case.

Keeton notes (1976, p. 58) that "persons seem to differ considerably in their quickness to infer a general principle from a

set of experiences" and concludes that a seminar is an essential companion to a field experience. Case and Lowrey (1974, 1975) found this to be true for the school library internships. Lowell A. Martin (1957) referred to the field seminar at Rutgers University Graduate School of Library Service as the "capstone" of the then required field experience. Within the structure of the seminar itself, the move from concrete to general and from principles to examples will determine the relationship between deductive and inductive learning, and will provide opportunities for the challenge or reinforcement of "espoused theory" as well as substance for fresh insight in as-yet unexplored areas of professional understanding. (Sheila Gordon in Keeton, 1976)

Task analysis and student assessment are the heart of designing the effective internship. Learning theory currently stresses the importance for learners to be focussed on clearly identified objectives in the learning process, whether it be mastery of a routine or development of skills in problem-solving. The Handbook for Professional and Administrative Internships (1972) ignores the "working internship" but stresses the recruitment for and design of "professional training internships," together with supporting educational seminar and evaluation phases of such internships. Detailed task analysis provides the basis for their design of internships, and student selection and self-assessment in terms of those tasks set the agenda for the particular student's learning experience.

The COMFIELD model, presented by Schalock and Hale in A Competency-Based Field Centered, Systems Approach to Elementary Teacher Education (1968), includes practicum as one of the variety of carefully chosen learning strategies in this instructional systems approach to professional learning. Sue Henry and her colleagues in social welfare performed a comparable analysis of the knowledge, value and skill areas to be learned in their project report The Field Experience in Education for Management in Social Welfare (1976). Such analyses become the basis for agency-school-student learning contracts and for student self-evaluation, ensuring productive field experience and positive progress on the part of the student.

Two major models of analysis already exist in the field of librarianship to which we can turn as we think of design of competency-based education. Robert N. Case's Behavioral Requirements Analysis Checklist (BRAC) (1973) provides a comprehensive analysis of 700 school media center tasks, grouped in seven major competency areas under behaviorally stated job functions. These provided a foundation for the experimental school library education programs reported by Case and Lowrey in 1974 and 1975. A second professional resource is the Career Development and Assessment Center for Librarians, established in 1978 as a project of the School of Librarianship of the University of Washington. While the twenty-one competency areas that compose the base for analysis in the assessment process have been withheld from publication to assure the effectiveness of the assessment process, inevitably they will become an invaluable resource for analysis of management tasks around which internships could be structured and evaluations determined. The potential of assessment centers for education and evaluation as well as for counseling is still to be explored by library education. (Heim, 1980)

Other somewhat less comprehensive analyses exist, expansion and refinement of which might well serve as beginnings (Hall, 1968; Orr, 1968; Pings, 1971). The question that faces us in 1981, then, is: Are library educators prepared to give the time to disciplined task analysis in collaboration with practicing librarians to provide an agreed-upon basis for the planning of competency-based education? (Wilson, 1978) If this seems overly ambitious, at what level can such analysis and planning feasibly take place? The implication of learning theory is that there may be a universal value in such a mode of learning, but this places demands on faculty and host libraries for careful structuring, for linkage with course content or field seminar, for autonomous student work, and for three-way evaluation. (Wilson, 1978, pp. 21-25)

There will be other issues that need exploration. There lurks the concern that if field work were to focus too precisely on particular patterns of behavior or service, too narrow a standardization of professional practice might emerge. (Joiner, 1978) Can the structuring of field experience leave enough flexibility for the unexpected to be experienced, since dealing with the unexpected is one major strength of experiential learning?

Typical Limitations and Problems

While learning theory now documents the great potential of field experience and of experiential learning for professional education it is obvious that success in the use of this mode of instruction is set about with exacting requirements. The relationship between course work and field experience must be carefully planned. An analysis of tasks for learning must be related to assessment of individual students' needs and interests and suitable host library situations identified for their placement. Host libraries must be prepared to plan jointly with students and faculty, and to permit responsibility and autonomy necessary to full professional practice. There must be frequent faculty-student contact during the field experience, and should include the seminar format where "discovery" can arise within the group. The host library staff, quite as much as faculty and student, must be open to theorizing from concrete experience and at a level that supports professional insight and commitment. And all students might be considered as having a right to this level of education.

This is a time-consuming program (Keeton, 1976). Shortcuts must be carefully examined to see what might be lost in making the program more reasonable as a faculty load, as a host library load. How ready are host libraries to accept students on the basis that learning theory suggests is necessary for the best outcomes? What are the halfway measures that are still "acceptable" practice? Do we recognize the danger of having the host library's practices become the "way to do it"? Shortage of field seminar or contacts with faculty may encourage that orientation. Will the student be given sub-professional tasks, routine clerical tasks, to ease a short-staffed library situation? Will the outcome for the student and the profession be the reinforcement of the status quo in librarianship through the "programming" effect of the host library? (Prytherch, 1979, p. 46; Lynch, 1975; Bucher and Stelling, 1977)

The expense of field experience has often been borne by faculty overload in counseling and administrative arrangements; by students in travel costs, in extended enrollment in library school, in fewer hours available for earning; by host libraries in staff time for briefing, planning, supervising, evaluating. A hidden cost not always planned for is the psychic cost to faculty and to host librarians of adjusting their professional styles to the demands of this form of instruction. Where programs have been successfully pursued over a period of time, these costs seek their justification in the quality of learning which is the product. (Martin, 1957; Lukinbill, 1976) Nevertheless, the decision for field experience programs requires adjustments in priorities and shifts of emphases within educational plans.

Graduate school acceptance of field experience for academic credit has by no means become general. While for many educators experiential learning has become a "mainstream strategy" (Keeton, 1978, p. 84), it seems likely that until the field of learning theory dominates the practical planning for experiential learning programs and is the foundation for interpreting its importance in library education, it will be difficult to institute field experience programs in this field comparable to those in medicine, law, social work, and education. Conant (1980) reported that "very few library educators" were seriously interested in field experience in the master's program and that there was no general sense of a worthy graduate educational goal that could be accomplished by such a program. Internships were seen as "balancing" or "offsetting" theory rather than illuminating theory, and were prized primarily for their service as a channel to the first job (pp. 34-38). Conant reported that host libraries often "utilize students in assignments that compromise the objectives of an internship" (p. 163). Is it likely that graduate school acceptance will precede the library profession's sophistication in matters of experiential education?

Only the education of school librarians has sustained a requirement of field experience (practicum or internship) over the years, and this has been reinforced by state law in most parts of the United States. All such internships are conducted within school libraries and media centers, not in other types of libraries. Because schools are generously scattered throughout the country, opportunities for placement have not been a serious problem. The question of whether to require field experience (at practicum or internship level) of every library school student usually runs into the problem of access to sufficient numbers of libraries of sufficiently diverse kind to absorb the numbers of students, year after year. Even the philosophically dedicated field experience program at Rutgers University Graduate School of Library Service (Martin, 1957), housed in an area rich in all types of libraries and supported by an unusually warm cooperation from libraries in the area, found that after some fourteen years of requiring all students to fulfill 250 hours of field work, it was no longer possible to sustain this requirement; the drain on libraries had been excessive. Hogg developed a formula for estimating pressure on libraries (Hogg, 1969, pp. 200-201). It may be relevant to review the function of library schools in the 1980s for diversification of objectives that include not only producing library practitioners but

also information handlers in a wide range of employ outside the formal "library" field, thus making requirement of "library" field experience less applicable.

The Conant Report (1980) proposes the extension of the library school master's curriculum to two years, with "supervised practical experience" an essential aspect of the program, "allowing the student to understand the relationship between theory and practice, to observe at first hand how the principles work, and to judge the inevitable gap between what professors say ought to be (sic!) and what is" (p. 181). The Columbia conference on Extended Library Education Programs looked hopefully to the two-year program as resolving the problem of time for internship in the curriculum (Darling and Belanger, 1980, pp. 35, 59). How real are the dangers that a two-year program would turn to internship as a solution to one semester of instruction in a less than adequately enriched curriculum? Would faculty load for internship supervision be properly acknowledged? Will all faculty be prepared for this task? Or should internship supervision be the work of only one or two faculty members who supervise regardless of the specialty of students or library placements?

Most serious students of the library internship recognize that the problems of administration are key. Gratzinger (1971) concluded that "the major reason for excluding field experience lies not primarily in the question of its value, but in the difficulties of administration, and in its academic priority in an already crowded curriculum" (p. 338). Case and Lowrey (1975) concurred, identifying thirteen guiding principles for administration of the field experience, including careful selection of field sites, faculty visits to the host schools, and a sound communication network among libraries, students and faculty (p. 60). Henry (1976) defined principles governing relationships and responsibilities between schools and agencies, with criteria for evaluating field agencies, field assignments, student progress, and school-agency relations.

There are two additional problems of challenging dimensions: the question of the readiness of faculty to work with experiential education, and the problem of evaluation of experiential learning in terms of both graduate credit and accreditability. Lukenbill (1976), in reflecting on his own experiments in experiential education, saw the importance of having instructors grounded in the theory and operation of group processes and dynamics so that clinical group occurrences could be made revealing and educative (pp. 202-203). John Duley gave detailed attention to the diversity of roles which faculty are expected to play in "Field Experience Education" (Milton, 1978). Urban G. Whitaker in his "Equipping Faculty for Their Emerging Role as Experiential Educators" (Keeton, 1978, pp. 61-71) identified specific barriers and the potential solutions available now in CAEL (Council on Academic Experiential Learning) and SFEE (The Society for Field Experience Education) through their workshops, research and publications. The work of Schubert and Lyngby in speech and hearing education underscores the same need for growth of understanding and skill on the part of agency supervisors (Schubert, 1977).

The problem of evaluation of experiential education is many-faceted. Only a few of the issues will be raised here. Evaluation

of student competence and of student growth must be based on more than anecdotes or sporadic observation by supervisors or faculty; competency-based education--based on task analysis, contracts among student and host library and faculty, and a range of measurements--seems to offer one approach of considerable promise. Bucher and Stelling (1977) concluded from their depth study of three groups of trainees that self-evaluation provided the only significant evaluation. It "always came back to the trainee's own judgment, her or his own sense of competence, the evaluation that they were performing satisfactorily based upon their own self-perception" (p. 273). They further noted that when students did report receiving negative cues, "in almost all instances they discounted the negative implications regarding their performance," labeling the source as incompetent or ignorant of facts, calling the criticism trivial or unimportant. The researchers concluded that as the trainee's sense of mastery increased, their emerging professional identity allowed them to evaluate the evaluators, and they controlled their activities by their own judgments (pp. 266-277). Does this mean the trainee is impervious to criticism? How is self-evaluation best developed? How does one make sure that criticism is heard and used? Contract learning, evaluation, such as that enabled by competency-based education seems one answer. Because of the large degree of autonomy necessary in field experience, self-evaluation seems the soundest policy in any event. Will graduate schools accept this? How precise must the task analysis be to assure guidelines to novices in their own evaluation? Can seminar and conference be sufficient backstop? Are there other techniques for faculty and supervisor appraisal of the educational process?

Evaluation for the assurance to society of well-prepared practitioners through accreditation of professional school or credentialling of graduates proposes need for assessment of a different kind, perhaps. Robert Kirkwood in a paper on "Importance of Assessing Learning" and Warren W. Willingham in a paper on "Critical Issues and Basic Requirements for Assessment" (Keeton, 1976) recommend and set forth in detail the goals and procedures of professional assessment centers that measure behavior. The work of Ruth Hamilton and Charlotte Wood at the Career Development and Assessment Center of the University of Washington School of Librarianship, although structured for career guidance, might well lend its tools and its structure to serve in the evaluation of management competence in field experience (Heim, 1980). Must every school develop such a center? What is the potential of assessment centers in library education for learning, for counseling, for education?

In the light of these complex matters, what is the reasonable position for library education on field experience in the 1980s? Does it remain a highly desirable program for many students, but one impossible of realization on any broad scale? Perhaps we are forced to explore suitable alternatives, moving from the more precise area of "field experience" to the broader area of "experiential education." What alternatives have already been tried in library education? What documentation is there of their benefits? How ready are faculty to take these on? How prepared are libraries to cooperate with these formats?

Alternatives

While we have been exploring the potential of field experience in the formats of "practicums" and "internships," and identifying the problems posed by these programs, we have recognized that there are a number of alternatives already making experiential learning available to library education. Morehead's Theory and Practice in Library Education: The Teaching-Learning Process (1980) explores in depth both the learning theory base and the learning strategies of field experience and its alternatives in response to what he sees as a critical problem of methodology in library education. His roster of alternatives includes: case method, role-playing, supervised (and unsupervised) independent study, observation, projects, and laboratory work, for each of which he provides guidance on use of the technique and on its contribution to the integration of theory and practice.

S. D. Neill (1975) in reviewing the place of practice in library education cites both Bruner and Gagne as learning theorists supporting the necessity for confronting theory with concrete experience and for interpreting concrete experience in the light of theory. Neill makes a strong case for the brief, structured field project in place of the more extended practicum or internship which inevitably is "uneconomical of the learner's time." A University of Wisconsin Library School Curriculum Committee study (1975) identified a "mosaic" of learning strategies in its program of clinical experience, with significant attention to the "orientation" functions of films, field trips, and course-related observations; to the "focussed" explorations available in course-related projects of actual work in a library, whether "a day at the library desk," story-telling project, or reference work over a period of two or three weeks; a semester-long project with time for planning, performance of a particular service (such as organizing and conducting a discussion program), and evaluation; simulations and games of a few hours, a few days or semester-long structuring of a course; and internships (in school librarianship and archives administration).

The "total curriculum" involvement in experiential learning in the mosaic style has been recommended by others (Case and Lowrey, 1974; Hempstead, 1971). Simulations and brief, intensive course-related projects are valued for their "economy of time and efficiency in learning" (University of Wisconsin Library School, 1975). Vaillancourt and Whalen (1973) reported under the caption "internship" a correlated course-practicum experience for students of special librarianship, the sequencing of which--both in practical experience and in theoretical discussions--provided opportunity for the comparative approach to understanding the structure and services program of special libraries.

Penland (1974) has constructed a simulated social system to allow exploration of the library-community encounter or "confrontation" built around the dichotomy of information access vs. political power. "The services and programs which the intern has to administer and deploy in the simulation provide an opportunity to study the relationship between the knowledge which the agency has to diffuse and individual citizens, groups, communities" (p. 455). Zachert (1975) presents a wide range of brief exercises, challenging role-play situations,

extended games and simulations each of which are focussed on particular problems and principles in library administration. Whether complex or single-stranded, such tools for experiential learning have been acknowledged as useful in library education.

Perhaps the most elaborate approach to simulation is the construction of a laboratory library. Pings and Cruzat (1971) concluded from their experience in administering a post-master's internship in biomedical librarianship that internship is justified only as in-service training, and that student laboratory experience should be guided by the faculty of library schools. Similarly, Prytherch (1979) concluded that a laboratory library as an "internal training unit" in a library school was an important supplement to observations, simulations, and other experiential learning. Morehead (1980) builds from Knapp's conceptualization of "library-centered library education" a recommendation for a seminar-laboratory mode of instruction built around a library school library. These recommendations have not come to grips with the "programming effect" noted earlier, the host library setting the patterns which students tend to pursue, and it may be important to reflect on the possibility that reliance on a "special library-academic library" model of library school library as a laboratory would not be of equal value to those preparing for public or school librarianship.

Probably the only laboratory library established by a library school outside the environment of a university library or library school library context has been High John, established by the University of Maryland School of Library and Information Services in 1967. This laboratory library in an urban disadvantaged area was one of four parts of the academic structure to prepare students for the specialty of working with the urban poor. Field work at High John was accompanied by courses in research methods and in service to the disadvantaged and by a student research project. Richard Moses (1972), the project director, saw it as "the toughest ordeal outside an internship at Bellevue," and affirmed that students learned, changed and generated change. For a year and a half the library school ran High John Library as a laboratory library, after which the library became a branch of the Prince George's County Library, and, said Moses, the student was no longer "staff" and did not feel the weight of responsibility that had forced learning. Was the demise of High John as a laboratory library an inevitable thing? Neither Moses, its former director, nor John Colson (1973), its intellectual critic, seemed fully prepared to say yes, but their quite different perceptions of the problems of a library school running a library for people are important concerns as library education begins to consider the laboratory library as the route to experiential education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, Chris and Donald A. Schon. (1974) Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, California.

Bewley, Lois M. (1975) "Student Takeover a Success at Burnaby Public Library," Canadian Library Journal, 32 (August 1975), 281-283.

Bichteler, Julie and David M. Price. (1974) "A Practicum for Library School Students--The Austin Program," Texas Library Journal, 50 (October 1974), 192-196.

Bone, Larry Earl, ed. (1968) Library Education: An International Survey. Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois, Champaign.

Bucher, Rue and Joan G. Stelling. (1977) Becoming Professional. Library of Social Research, Vol. 46. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California.

Case, Robert N. (1973) Behavioral Requirements Analysis Checklist. American Library Association, Chicago.

Case, Robert N. and Anna Mary Lowrey. (1974) Curriculum Alternatives. American Library Association, Chicago.

Case, Robert N. and Anna Mary Lowrey. (1975) Evaluation of Alternative Curricula. American Library Association (School Library Manpower Project), Chicago.

Coburn, Louis. Classroom and Field: The Internship in Library Education [Graduate School of Library and Information Studies, Queen's College, 1980].

Colson, John C. (1973) "The Agony of Outreach; Some Reconsiderations Based on the High John Project," Library Journal, 98 (October 1, 1973), 2817-2820.

Conant, Ralph W. (1980) The Conant Report: A Study of the Education of Librarians. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility, Inc. (1973) Clinical Education for the Law Student: CLEPR Conference Proceedings, Buck Hill Falls, June 1973. Meilen Press, New York.

Darling, Richard L. and Terry Belanger, eds. (1980) Extended Library Education Programs, Proceedings of a Conference held at the School of Library Service, Columbia University, March 13-14, 1980. School of Library Service, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Eisenbach, Elizabeth. (1972) "No Case Histories, No Papers, No Texts--Only the Reference Desk, or Learning by Doing," RQ, 11 (Summer 1972), 331-335.

Grotzinger, Laurel. (1971) "The Status of 'Practicum' in Graduate Library Schools," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 11 (Spring 1971), 332-339.

Hall, Anna. (1968) Selected Educational Objectives for Public Service Librarians: a Taxonomic Approach. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

Handbook for Professional and Administrative Internships. (1972) Resource Development Internship Project, Bloomington, Indiana. ED 070/387.

Harrelson, Larry E. (1972) "Attitudes Regarding Practicum: a survey," Oklahoma Librarian, 22 (April 1972), 36-40.

Heim, Kathleen. (1980) "Women in Librarianship." In ALA Yearbook, 1980. American Library Association, Chicago, Ill., pp. 317-322.

Hempstead, John O. (1971) "Internship and Practical Application in Educating School Library Personnel," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 12 (Fall 1971), 116-132.

Henry, Sue, and others. (1976) The Field Experience in Education for Management in Social Welfare. (National Project on Education for Management in Social Welfare) University of Pennsylvania, School of Social Work and Wharton Entrepreneurial Center, Philadelphia. ED 146/062.

Herrscher, Barton R. (1980) "Competency-Based Education; a Viable Framework for Developmental Studies Program Design," Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education, 4 (Fall 1980), 18-21.

Hogg, Frank Norry. (1969) "Library Education and Research in Librarianship in Great Britain," Libri, 19 (1969), 191-203.

Joiner, Bill. (1978) "Central Dilemmas in Programmatic Experiential Learning." In Proceedings of National Conference on Programmatic Uses of Experiential Learning, May 24-26, 1978, Dallas, Texas.

Keeton, Morris T., and associates. (1976) Experiential Learning: Rationale, Characteristics, and Assessment. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.

Keeton, Morris T. and Pamela J. Tate, eds. (1978) Learning by Experience: What, Why, How. (New Directions for Experiential Learning, No. 1) Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco.

Knapp, Patricia B. (1968) "The Library-Centered Library School." State University of New York at Albany, Conference on the Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature, April 19-20, 1968. Mimeo.

Knapp, Patricia B. (1965) "The Meaning of the Monteith College Library Program for Library Education," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 6 (Fall 1965), 117-127.

Krowles, Malcolm S. (1978) "Gearing Up for the Eighties," Training and Development Journal, 32 (July 1978), 12-14.

Lukenbill, Willis Bernard. (1976) "Content or Process: A Personal Look at Experiential Learning," Journal of Education for Librarianship, [illegible], 16 (Winter 1976), 195-204.

Lynch, Mary Jo and George W. Whitbeck. (1975) "Work Experience and Observation in a General Reference Course--More on 'Theory vs. Practice'," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 15 (Spring 1975), 271-280.

Martin, Lowell A. (1957) "Work-Study Programs--Recruiting Breakthrough?" Library Journal, 82 (November 1, 1957), 2743-2749.

Milton, O., ed. (1978) On College Teaching. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco.

Morehead, Joe. (1973) "The Theory Practice Problem and Library-Centered Library Education," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 14 (Fall 1973), 119-128.

Morehead, Joe. (1980) Theory and Practice in Library Education: The Teaching Learning Process. Libraries Unlimited, Littleton, Colorado.

Moses, Richard. (1972) "Hindsight on High John," Library Journal, 97 (May 1, 1972), 1672-1674.

Neill, S. D. (1975) "The Place of Practice in a Graduate Library School," Libri, 25 (1975), 81-97.

Orr, Richard H., and others. (1968) "Development of Methodologic Tools for Planning and Managing Library Services," Medical Library Association Bulletin, 56 (July, October 1968), 235-267, 380-403.

Palmer, Roger C. (1975) "Internships and Practicums." In The Administrative Aspects of Education for Librarianship, ed. by Mary B. Cassata and Herman L. Totten. Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, N.J.

Penland, Patrick R. (1974) "Internship." In Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science, Dekker, New York, N.Y., pp. 440-471.

Peterson, V. T., ed. (1976) Renewing Higher Education: The Competency-Based Approach. University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio.

Pings, Vern M. and Gwendolyn S. Cruzat. (1971) "An Assessment of Post-Masters Internship in Biomedical Librarianship," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 12 (Summer 1971), 3-19.

Powell, Ronald R., and others. (1974) "Library School Directors and the Master's Curriculum: An Attitude Survey," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 14 (Winter 1974), 157-163.

Prytherch, Raymond John. (1979) The Role of a Working Library in the Education of Librarians. Leeds Polytechnic School of Librarianship, Leeds, England.

Reece, Ernest J. (1936) Curriculum in Library Schools. Columbia University Press, New York, N.Y.

St. John, Francis R. (1938) Internship in the Library Profession. American Library Association, Chicago.

Schalock, H. Del and James R. Hale, eds. (1968) A Competency-Based Field Centered, Systems Approach to Elementary Teacher Education. Vol. 1. Overview and Specifications. Final Report. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratories, Portland, Oregon. ED 026/305.

Schubert, George and Alison M. Lyngby. An Investigation into Supervision during Clinical Fellowship Year (CFY). Paper presented at annual national convention of the American Speech and Hearing Association, November 5, 1977. ED 149/558.

Sexton, Robert F. and Richard A. Ungerer. (1975) Rationales for Experiential Education. (ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 3) American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Stallman, Esther L. (1954) Library Internships: History, Purpose and a Proposal. Occasional Paper No. 37. University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, Urbana.

Tietjen, Mildred C. (1975) A Study, Comparison and Evaluation of Instructional Programs at ALA Accredited Graduate Library Schools in the United States and Canada, with Special Attention Focused on Practical Experience or Field Work Provided within the Curricula. Council on Library Resources, Washington, D.C. ED 126-892.

University of Wisconsin. Library School. Curriculum Committee. (1975) Report on Clinical Experience. Mimeographed.

Vaillancourt, Pauline M. and Lucille Whalen. (1973) "Special Libraries Cooperate to Promote an Internship Program," Special Libraries, 64 (November 1973), 491-497.

Verner, Coolie, and others. (1970) The Preparation of Adult Educators; a Selected Review of the Literature Produced in North America. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education and the Adult Education Association of the USA, Syracuse, N.Y.

Warner, Allen H., and others. (1976) "Clinical Experiences and Clinical Practice in Professional Education." (Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) University of Houston. ED 123/209.

Williamson, C. C. (1923) Training for Library Service; A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of America. Carnegie Corporation, New York, N.Y.

Wilson, James W. (1978) Developing and Expanding Cooperative Education. (New Directions for Experiential Learning, No. 2) Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco.

Witucke, Virginia. (1976) "Library School Policies toward Preprofessional Work Experience," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 16 (Winter 1976), 162-172.

Woodworth, Mary L. (1969) Final Narrative Report of the Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program in School Librarianship. University of Wisconsin, Library School. Mimeographed.

Zachert, Martha Jane. (1975) Simulation Teaching of Library Administration. R. B. Bowker, New York, N.Y.